United Nations E/2000/88 (Part II)

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
13 July 2000

Original: English

Substantive session of 2000
New York, 5 July-1 August 2000
Agenda item 12
Non-governmental organizations

Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on the first and second parts of its 2000 session (New York, 15-19 May and 12-23 June 2000)

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
Part one*			
I.	Matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council		
Part two			
II.	Applications for consultative status received from non-governmental organizations	2–47	3
	A. Applications for consultative status deferred from 1998	4–6	3
	B. Applications for consultative status deferred from 1999	7–27	3
	C. New applications for consultative status	28–45	7
	D. Requests for reclassification of consultative status	46	11
	E. Requests for reclassification deferred from the 1998 and 1999 sessions	47	11
III.	Review of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Council	48	11
IV.	Implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/302	49	11
V.	Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304	50–126	11
	A. Methods of work of the Committee	50–69	11
	1. Accreditation	53–61	12

* Part one of the report is issued separately in document E/2000/88 (Part I).

00-53515 (E) 210700

	2.	National clearance	62–63	13
	3.	Deferment	64	13
	4.	Invitations to meetings	65	14
	5.	Review of questionnaires and quadrennial reports	66–68	14
	6.	Web page	69	15
B.		Consideration of special reports	70–124	15
	1.	International Council of the Association for Peace in the Continents	71–93	15
	2.	Freedom House	94–100	18
	3.	Transnational Radical Party	101–117	21
	4.	Christian Solidarity International	118–122	24
	5.	World Confederation of Labour	123–124	25
C.		Other matters	125–126	25
VI.		Implementation of Council resolution 1995/32	127	26
VII.		Provisional agenda for the 2001 session of the Committee	128–129	26
VIII.		Adoption of the report of the Committee	130–131	26
IX.		Organization of the session	132–144	26
A.		Opening and duration of the session	132	26
B.		Attendance	133–138	26
C.		Election of officers	139–140	27
D.		Agenda	141	27
E.		Resumed 2000 session of the Committee	142–143	27
F.		Documentation	144	28

Annex I

Statement of conference-servicing implications of the proposed two-week resumed 2000 session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations 29

Annex II

List of documents before the Committee at its 2000 session 30

Part two

II. Applications for consultative status received from non-governmental organizations

2. The Committee considered item 3 of its agenda at its 742nd-757th and 761st meetings, on 18 and 19 May and 12-23 June 2000.

3. It had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council received from non-governmental organizations (E/C.2/2000/R.2 and Add.1-9) and a compilation of applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (E/C.2/2000/CRP.1).

A. Applications for consultative status deferred from 1998

Israel Women's Network

4. At its 1999 session, the Committee had granted a request that consideration of the application of the Israel Women's Network be deferred to 1999 resumed session, which request had been granted. At that session, the application had been deferred to the following session pending receipt of a response from the organization to questions posed by the Committee. At its 746th meeting, on 12 June 2000, the Committee had before it a letter from the Israel Women's Network requesting that its application be withdrawn. The Committee took note of the request.

Local Government International Bureau

5. The application of the Local Government International Bureau had been deferred to the resumed 1999 session, at which time the Committee had discussed its earlier concerns as to the close ties the organization maintained with local government and whether that would affect its eligibility to be considered as a non-governmental organization under the criteria contained in Council resolution 1996/31. Concern had also been expressed over the fact that the majority of the organization's funding came from government. Consideration of the application had been deferred to the 2000 regular session of the Committee, at which the same concerns were raised. At its 746th meeting, on 12 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer further consideration of the application to its 2000 resumed session, pending receipt of clarification of issues raised by the Committee.

Council for the Defence of Human Rights and Freedoms

6. At its 1999 resumed session, consideration of the application of the Council for the Defence of Human Rights and Freedoms had been deferred to the 2000 regular session of the Committee pending receipt of clarifications from the organization to questions posed by the Committee. At its 748th meeting, on 13 June 2000, the Committee decided in the absence of any response to close the file of the organization without prejudice, owing to the fact that the Secretariat had been unable to contact the organization. The Committee made it clear that the organization could reapply whenever it wished to do so. In the light of the specific circumstances with regard to the Council for the Defence of Human Rights and Freedoms, the Committee requested the Secretariat to transmit its decision to the organization through the competent authorities.

B. Applications for consultative status deferred from 1999

7. Owing to time limitations and the heavy agenda of its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had been unable to consider the applications of the organizations listed below. At its 2000 session, the Committee deferred consideration of the following applications pending receipt of additional information from the organizations to questions posed by the Committee:

African Community Resource Center

Africa for Christ International

Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustin Pro Juarez

Korea International Volunteer Organization

Institute for Security Studies

International Prostitutes Collective

Management Sciences for Health

National Association of Women's Organizations in Uganda

Relief International

Global Environment Center Foundation

8. At its resumed 1999 session, the Committee had been unable to take up the application of Global Environment Center Foundation owing to time constraints. The organization subsequently requested that its application be withdrawn, citing organizational reasons. The Committee took note of the request.

Zimbabwe Association for Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation of the Offender

9. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the application of Zimbabwe Association for Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation of the Offender to the 2000 session, pending further clarification of a number of issues raised by the Committee. At its 751st meeting, on 15 June 2000, the Committee had before it a letter from the organization in which it requested to have its application withdrawn. The Committee took note of the request.

Christian Solidarity Worldwide

10. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had not been able to take up the application of Christian Solidarity Worldwide owing to time constraints. The application of Christian Solidarity Worldwide was reviewed and discussed during the 761st meeting of the Committee on 22 June 2000. The Committee posed several questions and replies were received from the organizations. When the Committee reviewed the replies, one delegation noted that the responses confirmed what the delegation had pointed out during the earlier discussion of the application — that the organization was the same as Christian Solidarity International (CSI), with the same legal registration number in the United Kingdom. It had illegally entered the Sudan on numerous occasions, had continued to carry out illegal activities inside that country without the clearance of the concerned governmental authorities and had direct ties with the rebel Sudan People's Liberation Army in the southern Sudan.

11. The Committee decided to defer the decision on the application of the organization to the resumed session since some delegations had requested more time to consider the matter. One delegation made note of the fact that it was accepting the deferral of a decision to the resumed session with reluctance, and stressed that a final decision on the matter should be taken at that session.

Human Rights International Alliance

12. At its 1999 session, the Committee had considered the application of the Human Rights International Alliance and decided to defer it to its resumed session pending receipt of further information from the organization. At the 1999 resumed session, that application had again been deferred pending further clarification. At its 748th meeting, on 13 June 2000, the Committee deferred consideration of the application pending further clarification of similarities existing between the organization and the Global Peace Foundation. Both organizations seemed to share the same contact numbers and membership rolls and also had similar financial statements. The organization was requested to clarify those matters.

Kashmiri American Council

13. The Committee had not been able to take up the application of the Kashmiri American Council at its resumed 1999 session, owing to time constraints. At its 750th meeting, on 15 June 2000, the Committee resumed consideration of the application. One Committee member expressed unhappiness that the organization did not respond to the questions posed earlier. He also stated that the articles of incorporation of the organization that it had supplied to the Committee contained secessionist goals and categorically mentioned the independence of Kashmir. The concept of self-determination was being translated into secession, which was contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The same Committee member also circulated the aims and objectives of the organization as indicated in its own publication, which were contrary to what the NGO had stated in its application for consultative status. That Committee member pointed out that not only had the organization not responded to all the questions posed by the Committee but also in its response it had enclosed documents that mentioned, among other things, the legitimate goal of the Kashmiri peoples for independence, which was contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Another Committee member stated that the Kashmiri American Council

was not a separatist group. It was engaged in awareness-raising and advocacy campaigns on the Kashmir issue, which was commendable. A third Committee member noted that organizations working against the purposes and principles of the Charter should not find a place in the United Nations. The Committee decided to defer further consideration of the application pending receipt of a response to questions posed by the Committee.

Vishva Hindu Parishad

14. At its 1998 regular session, the Committee had considered the application of Vishva Hindu Parishad, which had been deferred to its 1999 session. The application had then been deferred to the 2000 regular session of the Committee. At its 751st meeting, on 15 June 2000, the Committee reviewed the application. One Committee member, citing several incidents, noted that according to Human Rights Watch, the organization's activists were at the forefront of violent acts against Christians. The representative requested that in the light of those accusations, the organization provide a written explanation of its position. Another Committee member pointed out that a representative of the organization had been available to answer all questions in the earlier consideration of the application. Written questions were supposed to have been transmitted to the organization for its response. These questions were not sent to the organization and therefore the application was being continuously delayed. The Committee decided to defer the application pending receipt of the requested clarifications.

Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights

15. At its 1998 substantive session, the Committee had decided to defer the application of Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights to a later date, and had requested the organization to submit a revised application. At the subsequent 1999 session, the organization had been reconsidered on the basis of the new application that had been deferred pending receipt of certain official background documentation and the response to questions raised by the Committee. At its 751st meeting, on 15 June 2000, one Committee member remarked that although the organization had copiously responded to the questions, it had sidetracked some of the crucial questions, particularly those related to Article 2 (1) of the Charter of the United Nations, while others had not been answered at all. Some of the answers were not pertinent to the questions and some documents, such as the copy of the trust and the audited report on finance, had not been submitted to the Committee. The same Committee member stated that the organization was of a political nature and circulated copies of press clippings on the statements made by the head of the organization which in his opinion confirmed its political nature. The Committee member further noted that such political organizations should not be granted consultative status. The representative of another delegation was of the view that the organization had submitted comprehensive information to the Committee. Nevertheless, it was legitimate for any member to ask for more information from the organization. The Committee decided to defer the application once again, pending receipt of further clarification of a number of issues raised by its members.

Le Foyer musulman — Association internationale pour le droits de l'homme

16. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had decided to defer the application of Le Foyer musulman — Association internationale pour les droits de l'homme as the organization had not yet been in existence for the mandatory two years to qualify for consideration. At its 751st meeting, on 15 June 2000, the Committee reviewed the application. One Committee member requested clarification on the "anti-slavery activities" of the organization. A second Committee member asked to see the contents of the letter sent by the organization to the Secretary-General of the United Nation on the subject of Chechnya. He also requested information about the various missions undertaken by the organization in the former USSR. The Committee decided to defer its consideration of the application pending receipt of further clarifications and documentation.

Grameena Vikas Samithi

17. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the application of Grameena Vikas Samithi to its 2000 session pending receipt of further information. At its 751st meeting, on 15 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application once again since a reply by the organization had not been received.

Islamic Centre (England)

18. At its 753rd meeting, on 16 June 2000, having considered the response of the organization to questions raised by members of the Committee, the Committee decided to recommend that the Islamic Centre (England) be granted special consultative status by the Economic and Social Council (see chap. I, draft decision I).

19. Speaking after the Committee's decision, the representative of one delegation stated that although his delegation had joined the consensus, it still had concerns regarding the fact that the main goal of that organization was to promote the Islamic religion. The representative wondered whether the organization was a non-governmental organization or a religious organization. He stressed, however, that in expressing that concern he was referring to the promotion of religion in general and not specifically the Islamic religion, for which he had great respect.

Hadassah

20. At its 1999 session, the Committee had reviewed the application of Hadassah and heard a representative of the organization respond to the questions posed by the Committee. However, the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the application pending receipt of a written response to questions raised during the session. At its 753rd meeting, on 16 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application to the end of its June 2000 meeting pending clarification of questions posed by the Committee during the current session provided that a reply from the organization was received in time. An interim response was received from the organization informing the Committee that it could not respond to the questions posed by the Committee since its key staff was attending a board meeting abroad. At its 762nd meeting, on 23 June 2000, the Committee resumed consideration of the application. The representative of one delegation found it difficult to accept that such a large organization could not send a representative to the Committee to respond to the questions posed by members on its policies and procedures. The Committee member asked that the organization provide the Committee with a clear explanation for failing to attend the second part of its 2000 session held from 12 to 23 June 2000 although it had informed the Committee in its letter dated 6 June 2000 of its intention to send two representatives. He then requested that Hadassah send its National Director for Israel Zionist and International Affairs Department to the January 2000 session of the Committee to answer questions related to the "policy statements" listed on Hadassah's web site. Hadassah was requested to explain the contradiction between the mission statement as detailed in its application for consultative status and the one listed on the Hadassah web site. Another Committee member was of the view that it would be beneficial to defer consideration of the organization to the 2000 resumed session to give the organization time to respond to the questions raised. The first representative emphasized that the activities mentioned in the application of the organization differed from the mission statement displayed on its web site. He enquired whether the organization was part of the Zionist World Union, whether it accepted Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and whether it had any relationship with the Jewish National Fund and if so what Hadassah's obligations and contributions it was subject to under this relationship. He also asked whether Hadassah was in any way involved with "Operation Jabutinski". The organization was also requested to explain its position on the application of the Fourth Geneva Convention concerning the Palestinian Authority. He requested that a representative of the organization appear before the Committee at the next session of the Committee.

21. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application pending clarification of questions posed by its members to its 2000 resumed session.

22. Following the decision taken by the Committee, an observer delegation stressed that the organization had concealed its true activities and requested the organization to define its support for the Arab world. Another observer delegation stated that the Palestinian people were directly affected by the policies and practices of the organization. A Committee member reminded the Committee that the organization had responded to its questions at the 1999 resumed session of the Committee. He found it reasonable for the organization to ask for more time. Another delegation stated that owing to time constraints, he would reserve the right to respond to a number of allegations made in the Committee on Zionism and Israel during the resumed session.

Association pour la Fondation Mohsen Hachtroudi

23. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had deferred the application of the Association pour la Fondation Mohsen Hachtroudi owing to time constraints. At its 748th meeting, on 13 June 2000, it was noted that the organization, based in France, focused essentially on Iranian issues. A number of delegations expressed the opinion that the organization was politically motivated. Some Committee members referred to the objectives of the organization as being unclear. One representative stated his belief that the organization was an opposition party aspiring to take over political power in the Islamic Republic of Iran. An observer delegation stated that the organization was linked to terrorist activities. The Committee decided not to recommend the organization for consultative status.

North American Taiwanese Women's Association

24. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had not been able to take up the application of the North American Taiwanese Women's Association due to time constraints. At its 750th and 756th meetings, on 15 and 20 June 2000, one member of the Committee drew its attention to the organization's web site as well as to a number of its publications revealing active political activities on the part of the organization. The organization supported the independence of Tibet as well as the independence of Taiwan Province of China. An article openly proposed that Taiwan Province of China be allowed to participate in the work of the United Nations under its own name. China was of the view that the organization had clearly violated the Charter of the United Nations, particularly with regard to territorial integrity, and should not be granted consultative status. Other members confirmed that they too had knowledge of the organization's ties with organizations that supported the independence of Taiwan Province of China. The representative of India stated that any organization that worked against the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly in respect of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Member States, should not be considered for consultative status. At its 756th meeting on 20 June 2000, the Committee decided not to recommend the organization for consultative status.

Kazem Rajavi International Association for the Defence of Human Rights

25. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the application of the Kazem Rajavi International Association for the Defence of Human Rights, pending receipt of further information. At its 751st meeting, on 15 June 2000, the Committee had not received the additional clarification requested from the organization. A number of delegations were of the view that the organization was politically motivated. Some other delegations, including observer States, were of the view that the organization had ties to terrorist organizations. The Committee decided to not recommend the organization for consultative status.

Enchanté répertoire de la tranquilité

26. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the application of Enchanté répertoire de la tranquilité pending receipt of further information. At its 751st meeting, on 15 June 2000, the Committee decided to not recommend the organization for consultative status, because the organization had no real contribution to make to the work of the Council.

27. Owing to time constraints, the Committee was unable to review the following applications that had been deferred from its 1999 session:

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children

National Opinion Research Center

MINBYUN — Lawyers for a Democratic Society

Olabisi Olaleye

C. New applications for consultative status

28. At its 742nd-745th meetings, on 18 and 19 May 2000, and at its 746th, 748th, 749th, 754th-757th and 761st meetings, on 12-14, 19, 20 and 22 June 2000, the Committee considered the new applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification contained in documents E/C.2/2000/R.2 and Add.1 to 9.

Association Argentina of International Law

29. At its 742nd meeting, on 18 May 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of Association Argentina of International Law since the organization had not responded to the questions posed by the Committee.

Hague Appeal for Peace

30. At its 743rd meeting on 18 May 2000, the Committee reviewed the application of the Hague Appeal for Peace. The Committee decided it was not in a position to take a decision on the application because the organization had not completed the required two years of official establishment prior to applying for consultative status; moreover, questions were raised regarding the organization's registration in two different countries on two different dates. In addition, a number of delegations expressed concern about the structure of the organization, which appeared to be an umbrella organization, some of whose members already held consultative status. It was suggested that the issue of how to treat such federations of organizations be addressed during the discussion of the working methods of the Committee. At its 754th meeting, on 19 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of Hague Appeal for Peace to the resumed session since the organization had not fulfilled the requirement of being established for a period of two years or longer. The organization was requested to submit an updated financial statement to the Committee at its 2000 resumed session (see chap. I, draft decision I).

International Commission on Distance Education

31. At its 744th meeting, on 19 May 2000, the Committee considered the application of the International Commission on Distance Education. Questions were raised about the organization's listing on its letterhead of an individual who denied being a member of the organization. The Committee also expressed concern about the unauthorized use of the United Nations logo on the same letterhead. Additional questions were raised concerning the organization's association with the Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation, and further review of the application was deferred pending the receipt of a response from the organization to the questions posed by the Committee. At its 755th meeting, on 16 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of International Commission on Distance Education pending further clarification regarding affiliation of this organization with other NGOs, use of the United Nations logo and further information about the projects undertaken by this organization.

International Energy Foundation

32. At its 742nd meeting, on 18 May 2000, the Committee also deferred the application of International Energy Foundation pending further clarifications regarding its financial statement. One delegation expressed an interest in the reasons for which the Committee had not recommended the organization for consultative status when it had applied several years previously. At its 755th meeting, on 19 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of International Energy Foundation to its resumed session pending receipt of further clarifications regarding the financial situation of the organization, the composition of its board of directors and the relationship between its several executive organs.

Triglav Circle

33. At its 744th meeting, on 19 May 2000, the Committee deferred considering the application of Triglav Circle pending further discussion of the implications of the organization's having a number of active staff of the United Nations Secretariat among its members. The Committee requested a report on the precedent set in past recommendations on organizations with Secretariat staff as members. At its 755th meeting, on 19 June 2000, the Committee decided that the employer identification number issued to the Circle by the Internal Revenue Service of the United States did not constitute an official registration. Therefore, it was decided to defer the application of Triglav Circle to its 2000 resumed session since the date of legal establishment of this organization was March 1998, so that it had not been in existence for the mandatory two years to qualify for consideration.

Youth Federation for World Peace

34. During its 744th meeting, on 19 May 2000, the Committee reviewed the application of the Youth Federation for World Peace. The Committee expressed concern regarding the nature of the organization, its aims and objectives and its past and future

contributions to the work of the Council. Additional questions were raised about the organization's ties to certain religious organizations. After having heard a representative from the organization respond to the issues raised by the Committee, further consideration of the application was deferred pending the submission of written responses to the Committee's further queries. At its 757th meeting, on 20 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of Youth Federation for World Peace to its resumed session pending additional clarifications regarding its membership, the composition of its board, its finances and its relationship with the Unification Church.

Safari Club International

35. At its 756th meeting, on 20 June 2000, the Committee decided to request Safari Club International to reapply as the Safari Club International Foundation when it fulfilled the two-year mandatory registration period to qualify for consideration for consultative status (see chap. I, draft decision I).

Felegue Guihon International

36. At its 754th meeting, on 19 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of Felegue Guihon International, pending receipt of further clarifications regarding the objectives of the organization and the sectors in which it is active. Specific questions were raised by the Committee regarding health projects undertaken by the organization in Uganda and Nigeria and the role of the organization in the immigration of the Falashas. The organization was furthermore requested to provide a list of its projects executed in cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and to provide more detailed information on its activities and non-governmental liaisons in Ethiopia. With regard to the organization's stated aim of combating religious segregation, questions were raised concerning the methods applied by the organization to achieve that aim and the ways by which it monitored the success in that field of action, namely the social reintegration of segregated religious groups. Regarding the environmental projects of the NGO, the Committee requested further information on the nature of the cooperation between the organization and various African government bodies in pursuit of its goal to preserve the sources of the major African rivers. Felegue Guihon International was also asked to clarify some inconsistencies in its financial statement as well as of some terminology used in its application.

Global Peace Foundation

37. At its 754th meeting, on 19 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application of Global Peace Foundation pending further clarification regarding the relationship of this organization to Human Rights International Alliance and the nature of some of its initiatives. At its 748th meeting, on 13 June 2000, the Committee had before it a letter from the organization in which it requested that its application be withdrawn. The Committee took note of the request, although the organization was contacted and asked to explain its linkages with the Human Rights International Alliance.

Tamil Center for Human Rights

38. At its 743rd meeting, on 18 May 2000, the Committee reviewed the application of Tamil Center for Human Rights. A number of delegations expressed their concerns about the organization's connection with terrorist groups.

39. The ambassador of an observer member State informed the Committee that the organization was a well-known front for the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), a terrorist group banned in several countries. He stated that the organization had published literature promoting the division of Sri Lanka and its senior officials had participated in LTTE rallies. They had also participated in and addressed LTTE demonstrations in Geneva, where the so-called "Eelam" flag had been flown signifying the division of Sri Lanka along ethnic lines, which is entirely contrary to the fundamental Charter of the United Nations principle of the territorial integrity of States. The ambassador noted that his Government believed that the organization was in contact with the Tamil Information Centre in London, which had issued a press release justifying the 1999 assassination in Colombo, by an LTTE suicide bomber, of Dr. Neelan Thiruchelvam, a moderate Tamil Member of Parliament, who sought a peaceful solution to the situation in Sri Lanka.

40. The Committee heard at length from the representative of the organization who answered all the questions posed by the members and made a statement denying all the charges that her organization was

associated with LTTE. She stated that her organization was entirely devoted to the promotion of peace and the respect of human rights in Sri Lanka and other parts of the world.

41. At the same meeting, several delegations having expressed the view that the responses given by the representative of the organization were not sufficient to allay their concerns, the Committee decided not to recommend consultative status to this organization.

42. Following the decision made by the Committee, the Cuban delegation made the following statement:

> "My delegation considers that the Committee has taken an important and consistent decision on this application, pursuant to Council resolution 1996/31, after considering serious evidence of links between the organization we have been considering and terrorist groups acting against the Government of a member State through violent means. It has been a very good thing that in such a case the Committee has been in a position to reject the application and not to recommend it to the Council for consultative status, sending a strong message about the position of the Committee in cases in which such serious violations take place.
>
> "My delegation considers that this should be always the way in which the Committee proceeds when there is evidence and proof of such links and activities that go against the Charter of the United Nations and Council resolution 1996/31, which has not always been the case. My delegation requests the Committee to be consistent in the future when it considers similar cases and not to follow political or other considerations."

Dominicans for Justice and Peace

43. At its 761st meeting, on 22 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of Dominicans for Justice and Peace since the organization had not fulfilled the minimum requirement for a mandatory two-year period of official establishment. The organization was requested to submit an updated financial statement to be considered at the Committee's 2001 session (see chap. I, draft decision I).

44. At its 746th, 749th, 750th, 754th and 757th meeting, on 12, 14, 15, 19 and 20 June 2000, the Committee decided to defer the applications of the following organizations, pending clarification regarding further questions posed by the Committee:

Amitie sans frontières internationale

Center for Policy Alternatives

Global Crop Protection Federation

Kethea Therapy Center for Dependent Individuals

Comité international pour le respect de la Charte africaine des droits del'homme et des peuples

Pioneer People Trust

Väestöliitory Family Federation of Finland

Centre africain de recherche industrielle

International Center for Not-for-Profit Law

YWCA of/du Canada

45. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not review the following organizations whose applications were deferred to the resumed 2000 session:

Alliance musulmane d'Angola

Center for Migration Studies of New York

Center for Studies on Turkey

Community of Sant'Egidio

European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless

Fayette Companies

Federation of IJAW Communities

Girls Incorporated

Greek Council for Refugees

In Honor of Mandela Fund

International Family Health

International Society for Human Rights

International Women's Rights Action Watch

Jubilee Campaign

Kyrgyz Committee for Human Rights

L'Association mauritanienne pour le bien-être et le secours de l'enfant et de la mère

Lead (Leadership for Environment and Development)

Mandat International

Marie Stopes International

Mediterranean Women's Forum

MiRA Resource Centre for Black Immigrants

Monitor International

National Board of Catholic Women of England and Wales

Russian Public Movement for Civil Rights

Tektebba Foundation

Wales Assembly of Women

Women's Health In Women's Hands

World Animal Net

Yachay Wasi

D. Requests for reclassification of consultative status

46. At its 757th meeting, on 20 June 2000, the Committee decided to recommend the organization World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts for reclassification from special to general consultative status (see chap. I, draft decision I). Owing to time constraints, the Committee decided to defer consideration of reclassification of the Agence internationale pour le développment and the Association tunisienne des mères to its resumed session.

E. Requests for reclassification deferred from the 1998 and 1999 sessions

47. At its 738th meeting, on 16 May 2000, owing to time constraints, the Committee decided to defer consideration of all requests for reclassification deferred from its 1998 and 1999 sessions, including those of International PEN, a request for reclassification deferred from 1998, and International Peace Bureau, a request for reclassification deferred from 1999.

III. Review of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Council

48. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not consider agenda item 6 of its agenda on the quadrennial reports for the periods 1994-1997 and 1995-1998 submitted by 23 organizations in general and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (E/C.2/2000/2 and Add.1). The Committee also deferred its consideration of seven other deferred quadrennial reports (E/C.2/2000/CRP.2).

IV. Implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/302

49. Owing to the time constraints of its 2000 regular session, the Committee did not consider item 5 of its agenda on applications from non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development wishing to expand their participation in other fields of the Economic and Social Council. Consideration of this item was deferred to the 2000 resumed session of the Committee.

V. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304

A. Methods of work of the Committee

50. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had reconsidered its working methods with a view to their further enhancement. It had been noted that several of the mechanisms put into place did not function as smoothly as originally anticipated. The working methods adopted in resolution 1997/103 were considered costly in both time and human resources. The Committee had received a summary paper which

identified several important issues, including national clearances, timing of invitations, complaints, the substantive review of quadrennial reports, time limits for deferrals, NGOs on the Roster of the specialized agencies and applications from organizations whose defining characteristics were not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31 (grey areas).

51. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had decided to focus on two issues — the question of deferred applications and the procedures for inviting NGOs to attend the Committee's sessions, on the understanding that the other areas of concern would be reviewed at the first part of its 2000 session.

52. At its 738th, 739th and 740th meetings, on 16 and 17 May 2000, the Committee considered its methods of work. On this issue, it had before it a working paper from the previous (1999) session of the Committee (E/C.2/1999/CRP.8).

1. Accreditation

53. Throughout its discussion of the matter, the Committee stressed that its review of the issue was not intended to restrict the participation of the non-governmental organizations in United Nations meetings but rather to ensure that those organizations followed the expected norms and practices regulating that participation.

54. In view of the various incidents reported to the Committee involving abuses of the accreditation procedure, the Committee emphasized the importance of the Secretariat continuing to hold training sessions to better inform non-governmental organizations about the accreditation procedures and the principles of consultative status as set out in Council resolution 1996/31. It was suggested that training should be uniform throughout the United Nations, and that regulations regarding access to the Organization's premises and standards of behaviour should be universally applied. Although it was agreed that the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations of the United Nations (CONGO) could help in the process, it was generally recognized that the information training provided to non-governmental organizations was essentially the responsibility of the Secretariat.

55. It was suggested that the Secretariat distribute to organizations holding consultative status broad guidelines, along with other circulars and informative materials related to the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, at least once a year. The guidelines should be made available to non-governmental organizations when they collected their passes and displayed at the accreditation desks of all meetings of subsidiary bodies of the Council and other events, such as special sessions of the General Assembly and international conferences organized by the United Nations. The main provisions of the guidelines could be referred to by the chairs of the Council and its various subsidiary bodies at the opening of meetings.

56. It was generally agreed that the guidelines should emphasize the rules that NGOs should follow when participating in United Nations events, and should recommend in particular that organizations exercise reasonable restraint in the number of representatives that they accredit to meetings. Some members felt that that issue needed further discussion.

57. One delegate stressed that a distinction should be made between NGOs that obtained accreditation through consultative status with the Council and those that were accredited by the various bureaux of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, as well as those accredited to preparatory committees and special sessions of the General Assembly. In that regard, all secretariats of the United Nations concerned with accreditation should be familiarized with the principal tenets of NGO participation in order to prevent incidents during the course of the meetings, which would facilitate the work of both member States and non-governmental organizations.

58. As far as violations were concerned, it was again recognized that Council resolution 1996/31 was the appropriate instrument to respond on a case-by-case basis to the incidents that arose. Moreover, a number of delegations pointed out that organizations in consultative status should be accountable for the actions of their representatives and members because that status carried with it certain responsibilities and obligations. The practices of some organizations constituted a flagrant violation of rules governing their relationship with the United Nations and threatened the security of government representatives. One delegate pointed out that violations were predominantly committed by larger international NGOs that perhaps considered themselves immune from the sanctions stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31. One delegation emphasized that NGOs should be made aware that the Committee was deeply concerned over

incidents of violations and that their actions were being monitored.

59. A delegation expressed the view that a list of non-governmental organizations participating in meetings should be submitted to member States before the opening of meetings. However, it was felt that that issue needed further deliberation.

60. Overall, the Committee recognized that while it could request that the Council adopt more stringent regulations to govern NGO access to meetings and summits, it had to be acknowledged that the granting of consultative status conveyed certain rights to NGOs. It would therefore be necessary to find the means to engage all concerned parties in a genuine dialogue on the subject.

61. A representative of CONGO also spoke on the accreditation issue, pointing out that if all organizations adhered to the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31 there would not be any unfortunate incidents. She noted that with the recent growth in the number of non-governmental organizations, the question of access had become a major concern to them, and they often encountered difficulty in entering conference buildings and obtaining pertinent documents. Referring to the expressed concern of several member States that organizations from the South were consistently far less well represented than those from the North, CONGO gave the example of an innovative practice introduced to combat that imbalance in participation in the Millennium Forum, whereby several hundred northern organizations had paid an attendance fee which was used to establish a fund to help finance the participation of southern organizations. The representative of CONGO concluded by indicating that while the organization was not in the position to play the role of policeman to the NGO community, it could help to raise awareness of the various rules and regulations in force. She emphasized that CONGO was committed to the task of facilitating the relationship between NGOs and the United Nations.

2. National clearance

62. On the issue of national clearance, Committee members sought clarification regarding cases of national NGOs registered in one country yet active in another. A number of delegations questioned whether nationality applied to the country in which an organization was registered or to the country at which it aimed its work. It was also unclear to whom the Secretariat should address the letter seeking national clearance since the language of Council resolution 1996/31 was ambiguous in that respect. Many delegates expressed the opinion that an organization's nationality should be established according to the country of its registration, while others felt that an organization working outside its country of registration should be considered an international NGO. Some delegations were of the view that it would be necessary to seek opinions from all countries concerned and that additional information would only facilitate the work of the Committee. A number of members of the Committee were of the view that the clearance of applications should be made by electronic mail. Noting that current procedure left the determination of its classification to the organization itself, Committee members agreed on the necessity of establishing an objective definition to distinguish between national and international organizations.

63. The Committee also requested the Secretariat to contact the Working Group on Informatics on ways to improve its work in a technical way.

3. Deferment

64. Concerning deferred applications, the Committee felt that a distinction should be made between the applications of organizations that did not offer any response to the Committee's questions, indicating an obvious lack of interest on the part of the NGO concerned, and the applications of organizations whose answers did not fully satisfy the Committee. A third category would include applications of such a sensitive nature that extensive deliberation was required in order for the organization to respond to the Committee's questions and for delegates to reach a decision. In the first case, most members of the Committee were in favour of instituting the practice of setting a two-year limit during which three reminders would be sent out. If no response had been received by the end of the second year, the Committee would close its review of the application. The Committee's decision not to pursue consideration of an application under those circumstances would not be equivalent to withholding recommendation for status and the organization would be free to submit a new application at a later date should it so desire. It was generally agreed that the Committee would have to be more flexible regarding

the time required to reach a decision on applications from organizations with whom an ongoing correspondence had been established and those cases which by their very nature might require prolonged deliberation. A number of delegations made it clear that when a representative of an organization with a deferred application was present, the Committee should allow the representative to answer all the questions and avoid as much as possible sending additional written questions to the organization while its representative was still available to respond, which would reduce the number of deferred cases.

4. Invitations to meetings

65. It was noted that an inherent problem existed in the current procedure for issuing invitations to attend Committee sessions to organizations being considered for consultative status. Under current arrangements, given the timing and availability of documentation and the difficulty of predicting the amount of time the Committee would need for consideration of a particular submission, the programme of work could only specify a fairly broad period during which an application might be considered. It was decided that the Committee would give serious consideration to hearing NGO representatives with the longest distances to travel at the beginning of each session. Due consideration would also be given to the fact that not all NGO representatives could afford the financial expenses of an extended stay in New York.

5. Review of questionnaires and quadrennial reports

66. The Committee's discussion of the application questionnaires centred around improving on their effectiveness as decision-making tools and on finding more efficient ways of processing their review at both the Secretariat and Committee levels. Several delegations were of the view that the questions asked in the questionnaires and consequently the responses submitted by non-governmental organizations did not always provide the information actually needed by the Committee to make its recommendations. It was decided, therefore, to establish a working group on improving the questionnaire, which would revise the current questionnaire as well as update it to include a request for the organization's e-mail and web page addresses. The group would also work on improving the guidelines to send to organizations as an aid in preparing their quadrennial reports.

67. Most delegates agreed that it was important to take advantage of electronic communication technology to speed the application process, improve communication with NGOs and enable Committee members to preview applications and convey their preliminary questions and comments well before the beginning of each session. Although there was a great deal of support for the initiation of a viable electronic communications system in the Secretariat, the Committee emphasized that the introduction of new technology would not replace traditional means of communication nor in any way put at a disadvantage the number of NGOs with no access to electronic mail systems and the World Wide Web. Some doubts were expressed regarding the possibility of making the questionnaire widely available through the NGO Section's web site as the preferred means of application. Several delegates noted that that approach might not only alienate NGOs with no access to the technology but might also overwhelm the workloads of both the Secretariat and the Committee by encouraging even larger numbers of organizations to apply for consultative status. The Secretariat was instructed to contact other relevant bodies of the United Nations, particularly the Working Group on Informatics, for technical assistance in initiating the recommended systems.

68. When the Committee turned its attention to the quadrennial reports, questions were raised concerning their usefulness as monitoring tools, particularly since the quality of the information provided tended to vary. A number of delegations stressed the need to standardize the report. One delegate pointed out that owing to the large number of quadrennial reports under review, the Committee did not have time to undertake the necessary in-depth review. Another delegation suggested that a system of review other than quadrennial reports should be developed to address specific issues, such as habitual violations against the principles of Council resolution 1996/31. The content of the quadrennial reports was an issue raised by a number of delegates, and it was suggested that in addition to ascertaining compliance with Council resolution 1996/31, the Committee should pay close attention to the extent to which an organization's activities were compatible with and contributed to the goals and objectives of the United Nations. The

Secretariat noted that with 2,012 NGOs currently in consultative status, an average of 400 quadrennial reports were due annually, although the Secretariat and the Committee had the capacity to deal with only half that number per session. In the light of the Secretariat's information, the Committee began to search for ways of dealing with the problem. Suggestions included limiting the length of the quadrennial reports to two pages; limiting the consideration of new applications to allow more time for the review of quadrennial reports; and requesting enhanced resources, personnel and technical support for both the Committee and the NGO Section. Noting that the failure to submit a timely quadrennial report constituted a violation of Council resolution 1996/31, the Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare some statistics on organizations that were delinquent in their submissions.

6. Web page

69. The Committee supported the idea that the web page designed by the Non-Governmental Organizations Section should be regularly updated and improved to offer as much information as possible to non-governmental organizations that had electronic access. It was suggested that a demonstration of the web page could be provided to the Committee once the web page was complete and fully functioning.

B. Consideration of special reports

70. At its 736th and 743rd meetings, on 15 and 18 May 2000, and at its 758th-763rd meetings, on 21-23 June 2000, the Committee considered agenda item 7 (Consideration of special reports). At its 736th and 743rd meetings on 15 and 18 May 2000, the Committee had before it two letters from the delegation of Cuba addressed to the Chairman of the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights, regarding two non-governmental organizations in special consultative status with the Council, the International Council of the Association for Peace in the Continents (ASOPAZCO) and Freedom House, respectively. The Committee also had before it a letter from the Russian Federation addressed to the Chairman of the NGO Committee concerning the Transnational Radical Party, an organization in general consultative status, and a letter from China concerning Freedom House. In addition, the Committee had before it a complaint by the delegation of the Sudan against Christian Solidarity International, an organization whose consultative status had been withdrawn in October 1999 following a decision of the Economic and Social Council.

1. International Council of the Association for Peace in the Continents

71. One of the letters from the delegation of Cuba addressed to the Chairman of the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights reported that ASOPAZCO had accredited to that session in Geneva a number of individuals who "followed clear patterns of violations against the provisions included in Council resolution 1996/31", which established the appropriate basis for the relationship between NGOs and subsidiary bodies of the Council.

72. The letter circulated by the Cuban delegation stated that representatives of the organization had distributed information published by organizations established in Miami that were responsible for organizing, supporting and financing subversive activities both within and outside Cuban territorial borders aimed at overthrowing the constitutionally elected Government. It was stated that the groups in question distributed all manner of material, including the most aggressive publications against Cuba and Cuban authorities put out by Unidad Cubana, the Directorio Revolucionario Democratico Cubana and the Asociación de Exprisioneros y Combatientes. In addition, there were the Projects "Cuba habla" and "Fundación para los derechos humanos en Cuba", both developed and nurtured by the Cuban American National Foundation, a powerful lobby organization established in the United States with the open purpose of working against Cuba and through domestic policy mechanisms in the United States. ASOPAZCO was charged with having accredited to the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights two individuals linked to activities politically motivated against the Government of Cuba. The letter noted that one of the individuals had been imprisoned in Cuba because of her activities against the constitutional order, in violation of Cuban national legislation. The letter stressed that representatives accredited on behalf of ASOPAZCO had been "truly hostile" to members of the Cuban delegation, using offensive language and harassing them outside the Commission's meeting room. Publications circulated outside the meeting room of the Commission by those individuals were also brought before the Committee.

73. The organization ASOPAZCO was requested to submit a report on the incident at the next meeting of the Committee, in June 2000.

74. The report submitted by ASOPAZCO was taken up by the Committee during the second part of its 2000 session. In the report, the organization asserted that it had always been mindful of Council resolution 1996/31 during its participation in the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The organization denied having distributed any form of propaganda either against Cuba by Cuban exile organizations, or by any organizations, including itself, during the Commission's session. The organization refuted the accusations that had been levelled against it because none of the publications in question had been prepared, edited or distributed by ASOPAZCO. Moreover, it was affirmed that the organizations mentioned by the Cuban delegations in its letter had no relationship with ASOPAZCO. Consequently, it felt that the content of any publications put out by those groups letter should be analysed with no reference to ASOPAZCO. With regard to links with the Cuban American National Foundation, which Cuba referred to as the instigator and protector of certain Cuban exile organizations, ASOPAZCO stressed that it was a Spanish organization, headquartered and constituted in Spain, with no relationship to the Government of the United States. The organization stated that it was not involved in lobbying activities concerning either domestic United States policy or with the Cuban American National Foundation. Regarding the individuals accredited to the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights, ASOPAZCO maintained that they were both involved in human rights activities, none of them of a political nature.

75. At its 758th meeting, on 21 June 2000, the delegation of Cuba reiterated its charges against ASOPAZCO and requested that the consultative status of the organization be withdrawn. It also requested that United Towns for North/South Cooperation (UTNSC), an organization with ties to ASOPAZCO, submit a special report on its activities to the Committee at its 2000 resumed session.

76. In the lengthy discussion that followed, one delegation wondered why a representative of the organization was not present to respond to the questions raised. The Committee was informed that a representative had been present at the beginning of the June 2000 meeting but was unable to remain in New York until the report was reviewed by the Committee and had had to return to Spain.

77. Some delegations stated their satisfaction with the response conveyed by the organization, while others expressed the need for more time to assess the information provided to the Committee. Several members emphasized that organizations taking part in the work of the Commission should abide by the rules and procedures stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations as well as those established in Council resolution 1996/31. One delegation stated that when organizations made politically motivated statements or were known to have links with separatist organizations, they were directly impinging on the sovereignty of Member States. The representative of the United States noted that ASOPAZCO had presented itself as an organization focusing on human rights. One of the individuals, previously referred to by the Cuban delegation, had brought to the attention of the Commission on Human Rights the situation of several persons who had experienced difficulties in Cuban prisons, as well as other perceived problems in Cuba. The United States representative further noted that a plurality of member States at the Commission on Human Rights had found that there was cause for concern about human rights conditions in Cuba. The organization in question seemed to be addressing those issues and was not advocating the overthrow of the Government of Cuba.

78. At its 762nd meeting, on 23 June 2000, the Committee had before it two letters, one from ASOPAZCO and another from the President of UTNSC requesting that the review of the complaint by Cuba on ASOPAZCO be deferred. The representative of Cuba stated that, after carefully examining the letters, she found them irrelevant and not responsive to the serious accusations her Government had made against the organization. In addition, she found the letter from ASOPAZCO offensive to her Government.

79. Regarding the letter sent by the President of UTNSC, the Cuban representative reminded the Committee that that individual, while working for another organization, had been responsible for an earlier violation, referred to in resolution 1997/1 of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (see E/1998/8, para. 2), which had led to his being replaced.

80. Further to the request of the representative of Cuba that the Committee take action on ASOPAZCO at

the current meeting, one Committee member drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, as the formal request by Cuba had been formulated on 21 June 2000, the time would be too short for the Committee to take action. The organization would need more time to respond to the allegations. Other delegations also concurred that a number of elements in the case still remained unclear, while several delegations were of the view that the Committee was able to take action on the basis of Council resolution 1996/31. One delegation expressed its belief that it would be difficult for the Committee to make a wise and fair decision within the proposed time-frame.

81. Some delegations were of the opinion that any immediate action on ASOPAZCO should have been postponed and put forward a proposal to that effect, reminding the Committee of its usual practice of allowing sufficient time for an organization to react to allegations of misconduct levelled against it. In the light of the seriousness of the allegations and the desire of one member to allow the time for a representative of the organization to appear before the Committee, one delegate deemed that the time limit of 48 hours was insufficient. The delegation of Cuba opposed the proposal on the grounds that such a delay would enable the organization to continue its unsuitable activities for one year, further damaging the credibility of NGOs who were truly working for human rights. She reminded the Committee that the organization had had more than one month to submit the information required and had not done so in an attempt to delay any action on the part of the Committee on the matter. Having put the motion to postpone action on ASOPAZCO to the vote, the Committee rejected the proposal by a roll-call vote of 5 in favour to 12 against, with 2 abstentions.

82. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Chile, France, Germany, Romania, United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, Bolivia, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sudan, Tunisia.

Abstain:

Senegal, Turkey.

Explanation of vote before the vote

83. The representative of Cuba noted that it had always been the policy of her delegation to be flexible. In an effort to show the flexibility of her delegation once more, she would request, instead of a withdrawal of status, that the consultative status of the organization be suspended for three years.

84. The representative of the United States made the following statement:

> "My delegation has taken the Cuban complaint against this organization very seriously; ASOPAZCO has responded to the Committee's request for a special report. On Wednesday, we heard new information and learned of the Cuban delegation's call for the withdrawal of the organization's consultative status. Unfortunately, a representative of ASOPAZCO was unable to be here during the last few days, and thus could not engage the Committee in a dialogue.
>
> "Today, we are asked to take a decision on a three-year suspension of the organization. By taking action now, we have given the organization less than 48 hours to respond to this call for a punitive measure. ASOPAZCO has provided us with a lengthy response, which has not been translated into all the official United Nations languages. My delegation believes that any action taken now is premature and we will be voting no in the upcoming vote to suspend ASOPAZCO."

85. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the proposal of Cuba, by which the consultative status of ASOPAZCO would be suspended for three years.

86. The Committee, by a roll-call vote of 11 in favour to 5 against, with 2 abstentions, recommended that the Council suspend the consultative status of ASOPAZCO for three years (see chap. I, draft decision II).

87. The vote was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bolivia, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sudan, Tunisia.

Against:

Chile, France, Germany, Romania, United States of America.

Abstain:

India, Turkey.

Explanation of vote

88. The representative of Germany made the following statement:

> "My delegation would like to express its disagreement with the procedural course taken with respect to the motion put forward by the Cuban delegation on ASOPAZCO.
>
> "The Cuban delegation announced only on Wednesday its intention to ask for a withdrawal of the consultative status of ASOPAZCO, thus giving the NGO not even 48 hours to explain its position and to answer further questions. Now, we are discussing a suspension of the NGO's status — an interesting new proposal by Cuba which, however, still leaves the NGO with not enough time to react appropriately.
>
> "We believe that the Committee's practice to date has been to give ample opportunity and time to NGOs to react to allegations made by delegations. We would like to draw delegates' attention to the fact that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee has, both formally and informally, clearly expressed his concerns as to whether the procedure followed in this case would be appropriate. Having said that, my delegation would like to stress that it takes the complaint brought forward by the Cuban delegation very seriously. The Committee should, however, continue with its practice to give NGOs the broadest opportunity possible to present their cases before member delegations."

89. The representative of Chile wished that the Committee had not acted under pressure and that the organization had been given more time to respond to the allegations against it.

90. The representative of France stressed that the Committee, as was customary, should have heard from the organization under review. His delegation would have preferred action by consensus.

91. The representative of Turkey noted that he had abstained from voting although his delegation shared the concern expressed by Cuba. However, the organization should have been given more time to explain its position.

92. The representative of Lebanon underlined that the organization was informed during the first part of its 2000 session in May 2000 that the complaint against it would be considered during the current session. It had not responded to allegations and had abused its status through involvement in politically motivated action against a member State.

93. The representative of Cuba stated that her delegation would have preferred to have the action on ASOPAZCO taken by consensus. She underlined that the NGO had failed to answer the questions raised by the Committee, and that it had demonstrated disrespect not only to Cuba but also to other member States.

2. Freedom House

94. At its 736th and 743rd meetings, on 15 and 18 May 2000, the Committee had before it a letter from the delegation of Cuba addressed to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights concerning Freedom House. The organization, in special consultative status with the Council, had accredited to the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights an individual member of Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad "Frederich Hayek", an organization which had not been recommended for consultative status at the 1999 session of the Committee due to its connections with the Cuban American National Foundation and other politically motivated organizations which carried out activities politically motivated against the Cuban Government. The Committee requested Freedom House to provide a detailed explanation of the incident at the second part of the session of the Committee in June 2000.

95. At the same meetings, the Committee also had before it a complaint by the delegation of China against Freedom House and a letter addressed by the delegation to the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva as well as the Director's response. The letter stated that the organization had invited anti-China elements to hold a panel discussion directed against the Chinese Government, and had requested and obtained interpretation provided by the United Nations for this meeting. The organization was

requested to present a special report on its activities at the second part of the Committee's 2000 session in June 2000.

96. At its 759th meeting, on 21 June 2000, the Committee had before it the response of Freedom House and a letter explaining the incident referred to in the complaint introduced by Cuba. The letter stressed the fact that the individual accredited by the organization was a distinguished attorney, legal scholar, professor and expert on human rights issues and also the Executive Director of the Human Rights Institute at St. Thomas University in Florida. She was said to have been a member of the United States delegation to the Commission two years before the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The organization explained that she had been asked to be part of the Freedom House delegation to the fifty-sixth session of the Commission because of her field of expertise and had been invited as an individual and a scholar in her own right. She did not represent any other organization or professional affiliation in her role as a member of the Freedom House delegation. The organization noted that, if the Commission were to establish the principle of barring affiliates of organizations denied status with the Council from participating in the work of other organizations duly accredited to the United Nations, that regulation would have important implications for the work and the sovereignty of most NGOs currently part of the United Nations system. Normally in open societies, the letter stated, the principles of volunteerism and participation in many NGO activities was widely accepted. Eminent persons in the United States and other countries participated voluntarily in a broad range of groups. That was an essential foundation of a civil society.

97. Regarding the complaint by China, the representative explained that many participants in the meeting organized by Freedom House in Geneva did not speak English and the organization had gone through both the Commission on Human Rights Office and the NGO Liaison Office to request interpretation services. At all times, the Freedom House representative had presented himself as an NGO and the forum as an NGO-sponsored event. He had never claimed to be part of the Chinese delegation. The request for assistance through official channels seemed the appropriate step to take. The representative advised that it was the duty of the Commission on Human Rights to correctly advise Freedom House on how to obtain interpretation services.

98. A number of delegations requested clarifications on the structure and work of the organization, its decision-making mechanisms, its links to the United States Government and its financial structure.

99. The Chinese delegation made the following statement:

> "The Chinese Government has always attached importance to and encouraged NGOs in their useful contributions to the work of the United Nations. At the same time, the Chinese Delegation is of the view that all NGOs participating in United Nations activities must abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and must observe the relevant resolutions and rules of procedure of the United Nations.
>
> "The Chinese Delegation has read the special report of Freedom House carefully and received relevant information about this organization through other possible channels. The Chinese Delegation wishes to make the observations set out below.
>
> "The Chinese Delegation believes that the explanations made by Freedom House in its special report are far from satisfying. During the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights, Freedom House held an anti-China briefing at the Palais des Nations in Geneva. It deceived the staff members of the United Nations Office at Geneva and obtained Chinese interpretation service from the latter through unjust means. It is a very perverse example and its influences have been bad. As a usual practice known to all, the United Nations Secretariat never provides free-of-charge interpretation service to activities held by NGOs. Freedom House, which has had consultative status with the Council for five years and has participated in the activities of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, should know this very well. However, Freedom House still asked the Secretariat for free Chinese interpretation service, which is evidence enough that it was an incident premeditated long in advance. Freedom House submitted its application, as early as 20 March 2000, to the United Nations Office at Geneva, asking for the

provision of the venue and other services for the briefing scheduled on 29 March 2000. By that time, all had been determined regarding such matters as the topics and participants, and it should have been clear about whether or not interpretation service would be needed. However, Freedom House said absolutely nothing about applying for interpretation service from the Secretariat. Neither had it made such a request before 29 March 2000. But on the very day when the briefing was to be held, all of a sudden it asked the Secretariat for Chinese interpretation service. Obviously, its intention was to cause chaos and it tried to get what it wanted through deception.

"According to the results of the investigation of the incident provided by the United Nations Office at Geneva, Freedom House asked the Secretariat for interpretation service through office telephones in the Secretariat and said that it would be a 'consultation in Chinese', leaving the Secretariat with a wrong impression that the briefing was an official activity and leading to the Secretariat's decision to provide the interpretation service. Freedom House has undeniable responsibility for this incident and there is irrefutable evidence for its deceptive behaviour. However, Freedom House has exhausted all possible means to deny the charge, has refused to admit any fault on its part and has attempted to disavow any responsibility, showing no sign whatsoever of regret. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the abuse of its consultative status with the Council by Freedom House represents a serious violation of the basic moral principles of honesty and credibility as well as behaviour of an extremely irresponsible nature and in serious violation of Council resolution 1996/31. Naturally, it should be met by strong opposition from all members of the Committee.

"What Freedom House did, from the very beginning, was to run counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and it has deviated from the spirit of Council resolution 1996/31. In 1995, the Committee decided that the purposes and activities of Freedom House were not in agreement with relevant resolutions and therefore turned down its application for consultative status. In the years since then, Freedom House has had no intention to repent and correct itself but has continued to carry out activities in violation of resolution 1996/31. Freedom House is an NGO with its headquarters located in New York. But curiously, the force of its criticism and attacks has always been directed to the developing countries. It builds on rumours and unconfirmed stories, constructs lies and distortions, calls black white and produces extremely unhealthy influences. Therefore, its behaviour has demonstrated obvious selectivity and political motives and belongs to those activities explicitly opposed by Council resolution 1996/31.

"Freedom House, of its own will, has chosen to rub shoulders with heretical cults. During the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights, it recruited a number of members of heretical cults, and abused its consultative status with the Council in allowing them to speak on its behalf at the plenary and organize various activities on behalf of heretical cults. Such heretical cults, in one form or another, exist in almost every country of the world and have threatened the human rights and fundamental freedoms of people of all countries in the same way malignant tumours would threaten their health. Therefore, all countries have been firm in banning such heretical cults. Freedom House, on the contrary, has gone so far as to allow a member of a heretical cult from China to register under its name and participate in United Nations activities. This heretical cult has been selling its own version of Doomsday, and talking such nonsense as 'one should not take any medicine when he suffers from any illness or disease'. Due to the influence of this evil cult, to date there have been numerous suicides, murders and cases of madness. There have been 1,500 unnatural and tragic deaths. It is Freedom House that has openly supplied the breeding and growing ground for such a vicious heretical cult. This is a serious violation of the purpose of the United Nations to promote and protect human rights.

"Regarding the request by the Committee for Freedom House to submit a special report on this incident, the latter has been launching unscrupulous attacks and groundless accusations

against the Committee and its member States, going all out to obstruct efforts by the Committee to review and criticize its unjust and unhealthy behaviour. This has produced a bad impact on the work of the Committee and greatly undermined its seriousness. The Committee has always based its work on the principles of equitability, objectivity and transparency. It acted completely within its mandate to monitor NGO participation in United Nations affairs when requesting Freedom House to submit a special report and its request was made in strict accordance with Council resolution 1996/31. However, Freedom House has openly accused member States of the Committee of being prejudiced and has calumniated certain countries as authoritarian and dictatorial and pointed fingers at the work of the Committee. It has even divided the membership of this Committee into 'democratic' and 'undemocratic' countries, attempting to exert pressure on members of the Committee and create conflicts and undermine relations between them so as to prevent the Committee from reviewing applications from NGOs with equitability and objectivity. The fact is, it is not that this Committee has any prejudice against any particular NGO but that Freedom House itself has entertained serious political prejudice.

"What Freedom House has done constitutes a pattern of acts, including unsubstantiated or politically motivated acts against Member States of the United Nations, which has seriously violated the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as clearly stipulated in resolution 1996/31. We cannot imagine that such an organization will be able to make any positive contribution to the work of the Council. Based on the above positions and views, the Chinese Delegation would like to strongly recommend that the Committee can reach a consensus in this regard and make a decision to withdraw the consultative status of Freedom House."

100. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the above complaints to its 2000 resumed session pending receipt of responses provided by the organization to questions posed by the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee also informed the members that the report on the investigation of the incident conducted by the security authorities of the United Nations Office at Geneva would be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee. He also stated that he would address a letter to the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights on the matter.

3. Transnational Radical Party

101. At its 736th and 743rd meetings, on 15 and 18 May 2000, the Committee had before it a letter from the delegation of the Russian Federation, informing the Chairman of the Committee that the Transnational Radical Party (TRP), a non-governmental organization with general consultative status with the Council, had accredited a representative of the Chechen separatists and terrorists, who was given the floor at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights and identified himself at that session as a representative of the President of Chechnya in Europe and to the United Nations. In a letter to the Chairman of the Committee, the delegation of the Russian Federation stated that this individual was propagating, on behalf of TRP, ideas that were completely incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. By offering its banner to those who were responsible for widespread taking of hostages, slave labour and slave trade, burglaries, torture and summary executions, TRP had seriously violated its consultative relations with the Council, as stipulated in paragraph 57 (a) of Council resolution 1996/31. The letter stated that the study of other activities of TRP showed that the recent incident in Geneva was not the sole violation by the organization of the regulations governing the relationship between the United Nations and NGOs. In its quadrennial report of 9 May 2000, TRP had mentioned that since its affiliation with the Council, it had followed issues related to international drug trafficking. The letter stressed that TRP had promoted the legalization of drugs by launching civil disobedience campaigns, distributing drugs and denouncing anti-drug legislation.

102. The Russian delegation requested that, under Council resolution 1996/31, TRP had abused its consultative status and requested that the Committee take action to withdraw its consultative status. The organization was requested by the Committee to provide a written response to the complaint circulated by the Russian Federation at the next meeting of the Committee, in June 2000.

103. At its 759th meeting, on 21 June 2000, the Committee had before it the response submitted by TRP on the complaint against it. In its response, TRP acknowledged that it had accredited Mr. Idigov, from Chechnya, who spoke about gross and systematic human rights violations, the right to self-determination and the need to end conflict through negotiations. He also called for respect for the peace agreement reached between the Government of the Russian Federation and representatives of the Chechen government in 1997. Mr. Idigov also recalled that President Maskhadov, his government and the parliament of the Chechen Republic were legitimately elected under the international supervision of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). To TRP's knowledge, Mr. Idigov was neither a terrorist nor had he ever participated in such activities. TRP recognized that violations of human rights had been perpetrated on both sides in the conflict in Chechnya; however, Mr. Idigov had consistently called for peace and an end to violence, which was the reason why he was sent to Geneva. TRP was dedicated to the Gandhian principles of non-violence and it would be unthinkable for the organization to knowingly accredit a terrorist.

104. The letter submitted by TRP stressed that there was no evidence of any proceeds coming to it from the illicit drug trade, and it had never supported the free circulation of psychoactive and psychotropic substances. In fact, it had always supported the need to prevent the diffusion of those substances and to remedy the illegal liberalization of the drug market and the civil, political and social consequences of the deficiencies in current prohibitionist legislation. In addition, TRP underlined that the organization's drug-related activities at the United Nations had always been in conformity with the rules and regulations guiding its consultative status.

105. At its 759th, 760th and 763rd meetings on 21, 22 and 23 June 2000, the Committee heard several delegations on this issue. The representative of the Russian Federation noted that TRP, in violation of basic principles contained in the Convention on the Rights of the Child as well as other relevant international instruments, had waged a campaign against the prevention of paedophilia and child pornography on the Internet. In addition, the representative of the Russian Federation stressed that in reality TRP was not a non-governmental organization but a political organization. One Committee member pointed out that TRP had admitted to its misconduct and had apologized for it. His Government did not share the drug policy proposed by the organization but other European States did. Advocating the legalization of drugs was not a violation of Council resolution 1996/31. The member asked whether the organization advocated the illegal trafficking of drugs, and expressed the opinion that the Committee should be provided with evidence of this as well as evidence that the organization was dealing with paedophilia and child pornography.

106. A number of delegations felt that the organization's response was satisfactory. Some others believed that an apology was not sufficient, particularly if the organization was guilty of committing such acts as those mentioned by the delegation of the Russian Federation.

107. The representative of TRP responded to the questions posed by the Committee. He reaffirmed that Mr. Idigov, the representative accredited by the organization, had never sided with any separatist group. He had been one of the leaders of the negotiating team, along with the Russian Government, that had reached the peace accord in 1997. The Chechen Platform had never supported secession or independence for any province in any part of the world. Regarding the organization's focus on drugs, the representative confirmed the position of his organization mentioned in the letter addressed to the Committee. He stated that TRP's policies were aimed at the reform of drug laws as well as the fight against international crime. By criticizing anti-drug laws, TRP might have given the wrong impression. On the paedophilia issue, TRP's representative said that his organization had co-organized a conference on paedophilia with the European Parliament in 1998, with victims, witnesses and journalists among the participants. TRP had organized another conference on that issue on the Internet. The organization emphasized that they did not support paedophilia.

108. A number of delegations questioned the web site of the organization. One delegation said that the site gave direct links to clandestine organization that threatened the sovereignty of his country, and wondered if it was the policy of NGOs to conduct such activities. Another representative found an article on the site that "threatened to bring down the regime of Communist China". In addition, the article mentioned that the search for freedom in that country meant that

the Communist Party had to be overthrown. He wondered whether the organization was involved with any organization that sought to topple a member State. Other delegations questioned whether TRP had legislative capacities. A third Committee member referred to a number of "resolutions" and references on the web site of the organization regarding secessionist insurgencies in India. He asked the representative of the organization to clarify its attitude in relation to this. The representative of the organization responded that he was not aware of such references on the web site. The same Committee member stated that such references/resolutions were not based on facts and reflected the organization's lack of respect for the principles of the Charter.

109. The representative of the organization responded that no member of the organization had ever run for public office. Individuals who joined the organization never used its platform to run for public offices. Members of the Italian Parliament did belong to the organization; however, accreditation and official status was decided on a case-by-case basis by the Board of Directors. If individuals chose to violate the organization's policy of non-violence, it usually distanced itself from them. On the web site issue, he stressed that the organization did not support secessionism or overthrowing of a government through violence in any specific region of the world.

110. At its 763rd meeting, on 23 June 2000, one of the Committee members stated that he understood that there was a very strong desire within the Committee to take a decision on the withdrawal of consultative status by consensus. However, if consensus was not possible in the case in question, he suggested that the Committee vote for a three-year suspension of the organization's consultative status.

111. The representative of the Russian Federation stated that his country requested the withdrawal of status of the organization because the organization had violated the principles regulating its relationship with the United Nations; however, it would join the consensus and support the suspension for three years of the consultative status of the organization. That action would send a clear message that all NGOs should comply with the principles of Council resolution 1996/31 and with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

112. At its 763rd meeting, on 23 June 2000, the Committee recommended that the Council suspend the consultative status of the organization for three years (see chap. I, draft decision II).

113. The representative of France stated that Council resolution 1996/31, which regulated the relationship between non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council and the United Nations, was explicit and that the measure of suspension was a severe one out of proportion to the misdemeanour.

114. The representative of Germany made the following statement:

> "First of all, Germany would like to fully subscribe to what the French delegation has just said.
>
> "Mr. Chairman, you will have noted that my delegation joined the consensus about the suspension of the consultative status of TRP. Generally, I would like to express that we joined the consensus with reservations. We do not think that the case of TRP has been exhaustively discussed in the Committee. Especially, we had no opportunity to verify any information on the new allegations which were put forward only yesterday.
>
> "My delegation wants also to state that TRP offered its apologies concerning the misbehaviour of one of its delegates, both in writing and orally. Furthermore, my delegation wants to share our view with the other delegates that the representative of the NGO answered very well and convincingly to the questions put by the Committee. Under those circumstances, the punishment of suspending its consultative status for three years seems very harsh to us.
>
> "We do share most delegations' views, however, that this Committee should act by consensus decisions. We do acknowledge the flexibility of some delegations in this issue. It is in this light and after consultations with all parties concerned that we joined the consensus. We do it hesitantly, though."

115. The representative of the United States made the following statement:

"My delegation wishes to state that we dissociate ourselves from the consensus on this matter. We believe that the penalty of three years is too harsh. The organization apologized in writing for errors in Mr. Idigov's statement and a representative has come before us and apologized once again. The representative of the Transnational Radical Party has also acknowledged errors in other information discussed before the Committee, and has taken corrective actions to resolve those errors.

"Regarding the portion of the complaint that alleges that TRP is involved in drug trafficking, we believe that the organization does not engage in what one may describe as a profit-motivated criminal enterprise. Their activities, though unusual, are best described as publicity stunts."

116. An observer delegation noted that it did not appear that the complaints against TRP constituted a violation of Council resolution 1996/31. The purpose of having NGOs in consultative status was to afford them an opportunity to make statements, however critical of member States they might be.

117. Another observer delegation questioned whether there had been a pattern of abuses by the organization in violation of the principles of the Charter.

4. Christian Solidarity International

118. At its 743rd meeting, on 18 May 2000, the Committee had also before it a letter from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council, regarding the circulation of publications to member States at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights by Christian Solidarity International (CSI), a non-governmental organization, whose consultative status with the Council was withdrawn by the Council in its decision 1999/292. The Committee was informed that its Chairman had contacted the Chairman of the Council on this matter. The publications circulated carried the letterhead of CSI.

119. The letter from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan stressed that such action constituted a total disregard and disrespect for the Council, its decision and its members and those of the United Nations. The representative of the Sudan requested that an investigation be conducted to find out who allowed CSI to distribute its publications inside and outside the Commission meeting room, and that necessary action be taken accordingly in order to put an end to that pattern of irresponsible behaviour by the organization and to ensure that any repetition of such acts would not occur in the future.

120. In its response addressed to the President of the Council, the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights stated that it had taken immediate action following the complaint by the Sudan. Instructions were given for any material carrying the letterhead of CSI to be removed from the pigeon holes reserved for delegations, as well as from the tables adjacent to the conference room of the Commission. However, the secretariat had no way of investigating whether the distribution of CSI materials was done by another NGO or by an invited guest during parallel meetings. Similar measures would be adopted in 2001, and NGOs would be clearly informed prior to the fifty-seventh session of the Commission of the established rules and procedures. Emphasis would also be placed on the secretariat's responsibility to report any activities that violated those rules.

121. At its 761st meeting, on 22 June 2000, the representative of the Sudan acknowledged the action taken by the secretariat of the Commission to remove material carrying the letterhead of CSI. She also expressed the dissatisfaction of her Government that the secretariat had indicated that it had no way to identify whether the CSI material had been distributed by the organization or by an invited guest. It was the responsibility of the secretariat to ensure that NGOs abide at all times by the rules governing their participation in United Nations meetings. The secretariat should be more vigilant and stricter in ensuring that there was no recurrence of such behaviour. She also reserved the right of her Government to report any future misconduct by the NGO to the Committee and to the Council.

122. The Committee decided that its Chairman should send a letter to the Commission on Human Rights, stating that the incident had been seriously examined in the Committee and reminding them of the contents of Council resolution 1996/31. In the letter, the Chairman would also ask the secretariat of the Commission to take the precautionary measures to ensure that such incidents did not recur in forthcoming sessions of the Commission.

5. World Confederation of Labour

123. At its 1998 resumed session, the Committee had before it the special report of the World Confederation of Labour (WCL), which had been requested by the Committee to submit a special report, following a complaint by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, regarding the accreditation by the organization of unacceptable representatives to the fifty-fourth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva. The observer of the Islamic Republic of Iran had not been satisfied with the report, and had requested additional information and the presence of a representative from the organization at the 1999 session of the Committee. At the 1999 session of the Committee, additional information had been presented to the Committee by the organization. A representative of WCL, present to answer the Committee's questions, had proposed a dialogue with the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Office of the United Nations at Geneva. The observer of the Islamic Republic of Iran had welcomed the proposal; however, he had found the report inadequate and had asked the Committee to ask a new special report from the organization to answer the questions raised. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had reviewed the new special report submitted by the organization. Furthermore, the representative of the organization had informed the Committee that WCL was engaged in intensive discussion on the matter with International Labour Organization (ILO) representatives at Geneva.

124. At its 761st meeting, on 22 June 2000, the Committee was informed by the organization that the discussion was still ongoing between WCL and the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The representative of the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, speaking as an observer, stated that his country requested that the organization not accredit in the future the individuals wrongly accredited in 1998 and that it freeze its activities until the investigation was concluded. The Committee decided to wait until a representative of the organization was present before taking action.

C. Other matters

125. Under item 2 (Adoption of agenda and other organizational matters), on organizational matters, the delegation of Cuba raised a point of order at the May 2000 session of the Committee to call the attention of the Committee of the situation faced by Cuban NGOs coming to New York to the Millennium Forum since the representatives of most of them had not received visas for the United States. The Cuban delegate made the following statement:

> "My Delegation regrets to bring this issue here to this Committee, but we believe it is our duty to care about the contribution to all NGOs to the system. Many Cuban NGOs will not have the opportunity to participate in the Millennium Forum if they do not receive their visas today or tomorrow. Those representatives applied in a timely manner in Havana, and Cuban NGO representatives are probably the only ones in the world who need a special letter of invitation to get visas to come to an event of the United Nations.
>
> "This situation is a repetition of something that has happened in the past, and my delegation believes that the Committee at a certain point, probably under item 4 (Methods of work), should consider what could be done to avoid that bilateral political questions affect the work and contribution of some NGOs. My delegation urges the Government of the United States to issue those visas as soon as possible to guarantee that the representatives of Cuban NGOs can be present at the Forum."

126. The United States made the following intervention:

> "My delegation is aware that there are problems associated with the granting of visas to several Cubans who wish to travel to New York to attend the Millennium Forum. As our Cuban colleagues pointed out, Cuba and the United States have been discussing the problem over the last several days and are trying to resolve the remaining difficulties. The United States places much importance to NGO attendance at the Millennium Forum, and is working diligently to insure that all invitees can attend.
>
> "I wish to assure members of the Committee that any delay in granting visas to Cuban nationals is in no way the result of bilateral problems confronting Cuba and the United States. In fact, the United States is aware of and currently working to resolve visa difficulties that

exist in several other countries. In the case of Cuba, I have come to understand that many of the delayed visas result from individuals not filing their applications on time. As our Cuban colleague knows, the United States requires two weeks to process visa applications from Cuba. For the visas in question, the two-week processing time has not yet expired. Nevertheless, my delegation is working to address the Cuban complaint."

VI. Implementation of Council resolution 1995/32

127. There were no applications from organizations of indigenous people seeking consultative status with the Economic and Social Council in accordance with Council resolution 1995/32.

VII. Provisional agenda for the 2001 session of the Committee

128. The Committee considered item 8 at its 763rd meeting, on 23 June 2000. It had before it the draft provisional agenda for its 2001 session (E/C.2/2000/L.1).

129. At the same meeting, after a statement by the representative of Algeria, the Committee approved the provisional agenda for its 2001 session, as orally amended, for submission to the Economic and Social Council (see chap. I, draft decision IV).

VIII. Adoption of the report of the Committee

130. At the 763rd meeting on 23 June, the Rapporteur introduced the draft report as contained in document E/C.2/2000/L.2, as well as an informal paper.

131. At the same meeting, following statements by the representatives of Cuba and India, the Committee adopted the draft report, as orally amended, and authorized the Rapporteur to finalize it in consultation with the members of the Committee, as appropriate.

IX. Organization of the session

A. Opening and duration of the session

132. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations held the first part of its 2000 session from 15 to 19 May 2000 and the second part from 12 to 23 June 2000. The Committee held 27 meetings (736th to 763rd).

B. Attendance

133. The representatives of the following States Members of the Committee attended the session: Algeria, Bolivia, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America.

134. The following States Members of the United Nations were represented by observers: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela.

135. The following non-member State was represented by an observer: Holy See.

136. The following organization, having received a standing invitation to participate as an observer in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly, was represented by an observer: Palestine.

137. The following specialized agencies were represented: United Nations Industrial Development Organization, World Intellectual Property Organization, World Meteorological Organization.

138. The following non-governmental organizations were represented: Alan Guttmacher Institute, Arab Center for the Independence of the Judiciary and the Legal Profession, Citizens Coalition for Economic Justice, Dominicans for Justice and Peace, Felegue Guihon International, Fonds E7 pour le développement énergetique durable, Franciscans International, Freedom House, General Arab Women Federation, Girls Incorporated, Global Eco-Village Network, Human Rights International Alliance, Human Rights Watch, IHRAAM Rights International — American

Minorities, International Council of the Association for Peace in the Continents, International Association of Educators, International Energy Foundation, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Presentation Association of the Sisters of the Presentation, International Women's Rights Action Watch, Islamic Centre (England), Radin Institute for Family Health Education and Promotion, Safari Club International, Transnational Radical Party, Union of Kuwaiti Women Associations, United Nations Watch, WFM-CDIL, World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, Youth Federation for World Peace.

C. Election of officers

139. At its 736th meeting, on 15 May, the Committee elected the following officers by acclamation:

Chairman

Levent Bilman (Turkey)

Vice-Chairmen

Mercedes de Armas Garcia (Cuba)
Munawar Saeed Bhatti (Pakistan)
Mihaela Blajan (Romania)
Ilham Ibrahim Mohamed Ahmed (Sudan)

140. At its 738th meeting, on 16 May, the Committee elected, by acclamation, Munawar Saeed Bhatti (Pakistan) to serve as Rapporteur.

D. Agenda

141. At the 736th meeting, on 15 May, the Committee adopted the provisional agenda for its 2000 session contained in document E/C.2/2000/1, as orally revised. The agenda was as follows:

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.
3. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations:
   (a) Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from the 1999 session of the Committee;
   (b) New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification.
4. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304:
   (a) Process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations;
   (b) Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31;
   (c) Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Secretariat;
   (d) Other related matters.
5. Implementation of Economic and Social Council decision 1996/302.
6. Review of deferred quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.
7. Consideration of special reports.
8. Provisional agenda and documentation for the session of the Committee to be held in the year 2001.
9. Adoption of the report of the Committee.

E. Resumed 2000 session of the Committee

142. At its 763rd meeting, on 23 June, the Committee decided to recommend that the Council adopt the following draft decision (see chap. I, draft decision III), which was read out by the Chairman:

"The Economic and Social Council decides to authorize the Committee on Non-

Governmental Organizations to hold a resumed session for a period of two weeks, in January/February 2001, in order to complete the work of its 2000 session."

143. A statement of conference-servicing implications on the proposal, which was before the Committee, is contained in annex I to the present report.

F. Documentation

144. The list of documents before the 2000 session is contained in annex II.

Annex I

Statement of conference-servicing implications of the proposed two-week resumed 2000 session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

1. Under the terms of the draft decision, the Economic and Social Council would decide to authorize the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to hold a resumed session for a period of two weeks in January/February 2001 in order to complete the work of its 2000 session.

2. The proposal would entail the provision of 20 meetings (two meetings per day), with full interpretation services. There would be 200 pages of pre-session, 10 pages of in-session and 30 pages of post-session documentation in six languages.

3. It is understood that the session will be held subject to the availability of conference facilities and services. In this regard, it has been tentatively agreed that the session will be held from 8 to 19 January 2001.

4. The conference-servicing requirements of the above meetings are estimated at $195,700 at full cost. The extent to which the Organization's capacity would need to be supplemented by temporary assistance resources can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 2000-2001. However, provision is made under the relevant section for conference services of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 not only for meetings programmed at the time of budget preparation but also for meetings authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings are consistent with the pattern of meetings of past years. Consequently, should the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations adopt the draft decision, no additional appropriation would be required.

Annex II

List of documents before the Committee at its 2000 session

Symbol	*Agenda*	*Title or description*
E/C.2/2000/1	2	Annotated provisional agenda
E/C.2/2000/2 and Add.1	6	Note by the Secretary-General containing quadrennial reports, 1994-1997 and 1995-1998, submitted through the Secretary-General pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31
E/C.2/2000/R.2 and Add.1-9	3 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status
E/C.2/2000/R.3 and Add.1	3 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing requests for reclassification
E/C.2/2000/CRP.1	3 (a)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions of the Committee held in 1998 and 1999
E/C.2/2000/CRP.2	6	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing compilation of deferred quadrennial reports
E/C.2/2000/CRP.3	3 (a)	Deferred applications for reclassification
E/C.2/2000/CRP.4	2	Requests by non-governmental organizations to be heard by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 2000
E/C.2/2000/L.1	8	Provisional agenda for the session of the Committee to be held in the year 2001
E/C.2/2000/L.2	9	Draft report